

REMARKS-ARGUMENTS

Claims 16-35 are pending in the application identified above. The Examiner has rejected claims 16-35 in the Office Action dated July 12, 2007 ("Office Action"). By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 16, 24, and 26. Support for the amendments may be found, for example at paragraph [065]. Applicants submit that claims 16-35 are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16 and 19-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,745,712 ("Turpin") in view of U.S. Patent 6,597,381 ("Eskridge") and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,920,608 ("Davis"). The Examiner also rejected claims 17-18 as unpatentable over Turpin, in view of Eskridge, in further view of Davis, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,389,434 ("Rivette"). Applicants hereby traverse these rejections.

In the present application, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claims. For example, neither reference teaches a layout view for "displaying a representation of the form that provides a preview of the location of the layout items" where the layout items in the layout view include "a label that summarizes the information to be entered into the layout item" as recited in Applicants' amended claims 16, 24, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 16-35 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 16 and 19-34

Turpin discloses a system “for generating and using form data files that define: (a) a graphical image of a goal oriented form for display on a monitor; and (b) a graphical image of at least one decision tree.” See Turpin, col. 2:33-37. As part of the system, Turpin discloses a form tool which “operates much like a drawing package and displays forms as they are being defined.” Turpin, col. 17:46-48. Turpin uses Figure 13 to illustrate the form tool, see Turpin, col. 17:65-18:10, but Turpin also uses Figure 13 to illustrate a user completing an output form, see Turpin, col. 14:47-67. Accordingly, the wording disclosed in Turpin for the fields of the form tool corresponds exactly to the wording of the output form.

Further, the section of Turpin identified by the Examiner as providing a preview of the layout items in their position on the form (see Office Action, p. 3) instead discloses a view of a decision tree, not of the associated form that is output to the user. See Turpin, Fig. 15. Thus, this decision tree view discloses the logical relationship between the nodes, but not the position of the nodes in the output form. Accordingly, Turpin fails to disclose or suggest “displaying a representation of the form that provides a preview of the location of the layout items” where the layout items in the layout view include “a label that summarizes the information to be entered into the layout item” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16, 24, and 26.

Eskridge fails to cure this deficiency. Eskridge discloses a system and method for an automated optical inspection system. See Eskridge, col. 1:6-9. As part of the system and method disclosed in Eskridge, a graphical user interface may show a graphical display area. See Eskridge, col. 6:33-35. As described in Eskridge, however, the graphical display area may show components on an automated optical inspection

system not on a form. See Eskridge, col. 10:3-10; Fig. 1, element 20. Because Eskridge discloses a system for inspecting components on, for example, a printed wiring board, see Eskridge, col. 6:25-27, Eskridge does not result in an output form nor does it include a preview of a form to be sent to an output device. Further, Eskridge does not disclose the use of labels on a preview of a form. As a result, Eskridge fails to teach or suggest a form layout view “displaying a representation of the form that provides a preview of the location of the layout items” where the layout items in the layout view include “a label that summarizes the information to be entered into the layout item” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16, 24, and 26.

Finally, Davis fails to correct the deficiencies of both Eskridge and Turpin. Davis discloses “a computer markup language for use in a data browser and manipulator.” See Davis, col. 1:28-29. This markup language, identified as RDML in Davis, includes an editor that “permits users to edit the actual elements and attributes of an RDML, RMML, or RDSL document.” See Davis, col. 19:27-29. Davis, however, fails to disclose that the editor displays a representation of a form that includes labels for the layout items on the form. Davis also includes a description of a data viewer that provides different views that may be used to view information in RDML documents. See Davis, col. 36:28-31. These views include “a chart view, which shows graphical charts and graphs of the data, . . . a tree view showing hierarchical representations of the line items[,] . . . a spreadsheet view which shows a data sheet similar to a spreadsheet, and a footnote view which shows the text of footnotes associated with RDML documents.” See Davis, col. 36:31-40.

None of these views in Davis, however, shows the layout of items in a form. Further, while some of the views may contain information or descriptions of items within the view, none of these views is a layout view. For example, Fig. 14A, identified by the Examiner on page 6 of the current Office Action as allegedly meeting the limitation “wherein each of the layout items contains a summary of information,” fails to show a layout view. In fact, this view displays “the chart view in the top half of the screen, and the tree view in the lower half.” See Davis, col. 36:58-59. The disclosure of a tree view in Davis, however, is merely cumulative of the tree view disclosed in Turpin. *Compare* Davis, Fig. 14A *with* Turpin Fig. 15. Just as no reason exists to import the features in the tree view of Turpin to a layout view, so too is there no reason to import the features in the tree view of Davis to a layout view. Similarly, no reason exists to import the features in the other views of Davis to a layout view, which Davis completely fails to disclose. Accordingly, Davis fails to teach or suggest “displaying a representation of the form that provides a preview of the location of the layout items” where the layout items in the layout view include “a label that summarizes the information to be entered into the layout item” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16, 24, and 26. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 16, 24, and 26 are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow claims 16, 24, and 26.

Claims 19-23 and 31-32 depend from amended claim 16; claims 25 and 33 depend from amended claim 24; and claims 27-30 and 34 depend from amended claim 26. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the

reasons cited above for amended claims 16, 24, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow these claims.

Claims 17-18

The Examiner rejected claims 17-18 as allegedly unpatentable over Turpin, in view of Eskridge, in view of Davis, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,389,434 ("Rivette"). None of these cited references, however, teaches all elements of Applicants' claims. For example, as discussed above, neither Turpin nor Eskridge at least teaches "displaying a representation of the form that provides a preview of the location of the layout items" where the layout items in the layout view include "a label that summarizes the information to be entered into the layout item" as recited in Applicants' amended claim 16. Rivette fails to cure this deficiency.

Rivette discloses a system and method for annotating documents and other media. See Rivette, Abstract. According to Rivette, different views may be displayed in the disclosed system, including "a note centric view, an object centric view, a link centric view, and a user-defined view." See Rivette, col. 17:7-10. Of these views, the link view may be "useful for obtaining a high level display of the note grouping/not/sub-note hierarchy, and sub-note/data object portion linkage." See Rivette, col. 19:10-12. As shown in Figure 29, these notes may also contain titles, such as "Sub-note A," "Data Object A," and "Note-grouping A." This view, however, only shows the logical connection between notes and objects as opposed to their location on a form. Further, none of these titles provides a label that summarizes the information contained with the note. For example, "sub-note A" does not describe the type of information contained within the sub-note. Additionally, Rivette fails to disclose in either the link view, or any

of the other views, displaying a representation of the layout of a form. Accordingly, Rivette fails at least to teach or suggest “displaying a representation of the form that provides a preview of the location of the layout items” where the layout items in the layout view include “a label that summarizes the information to be entered into the layout item” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 16. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 16 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 17-18 depend from amended claim 16. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons cited above for amended claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow these claims.

Claim 35

Applicants note that while the Examiner has indicated that claim 35 is rejected, the Examiner has not provided an analysis of claim 35 in which the prior art is applied to the limitations in this claim. If further office actions are issued, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide the reasons for rejecting claim 35 in the next office action. Applicants also respectfully request that if a subsequent office action is issued, that this subsequent office action not be made final to allow the Applicants an opportunity to respond to the new reason for rejecting this un-amended claim. See MPEP § 706.07(a) (a second action final rejection is not proper where the Examiner introduces a new ground for rejection that is not necessitated by an applicant’s amendment).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 21, 2007

By: Amela X. Prager 45,687
for Jeffrey E. Danley
Reg. No. 57,228